

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 3, 5, 11, 13, 15, 21, 23 and 25 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-26 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

ENTRY OF RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116:

Applicants request entry of this Rule 116 Response and Request for Reconsideration because:

(a) it is believed that the amendments of claims 3, 5, 11, 13, 15, 21, 23 and 25 put this application into condition for allowance;

(b) the amendments were not earlier presented because the Applicants believed in good faith that the cited prior art did not disclose the present invention as previously claimed;

(c) the amendments of claims 3, 5, 11, 13, 15, 21, 23 and 25 should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised; and/or

(d) the amendments do not significantly alter the scope of the claims and place the application at least into a better form for appeal. No new features or new issues are being raised.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures sets forth in §714.12 that "[a]ny amendment that would place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered." (Underlining added for emphasis) Moreover, §714.13 sets forth that "[t]he Proposed Amendment should be given sufficient consideration to determine whether the claims are in condition for allowance and/or whether the issues on appeal are simplified." The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures further articulates that the reason for any non-entry should be explained expressly in the Advisory Action.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

In the Office Action, at page 2, numbered paragraphs 5-31, claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Isohata et al. (USPN 6,288,489). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner stated that a screw hole 7 of Isohata (USPN 6,288,489) corresponds to a small hole or a recess of the present invention. However, according to Isohata, the screw hole of the main frame 17 is provided on a tab 5, and the tab is pushed into corresponding socket 6. Therefore, when the tab is pushed into corresponding socket 6, a lower surface of main frame 7 contacts an upper surface of a heat-conducting plate 18. Therefore, the lower surface of the main frame 17 does not contact the adhesive tapes. The tab 5 including the screw hole 7 has the same lower surface as that of the main frame 17. Therefore, the lower surface of the tab 5, including the screw hole 7, does not contact the adhesive tapes. Further, a lower surface of the socket 6 is positioned at a higher position than the lower surface of the tab 5. Therefore, the lower surface of the socket 6, including the screw hole 7, does not contact the adhesive tapes. Claim 13 has been amended for clarity. As is clearly described in claim 1, the small holes are provided where the adhesive tapes are fixed. However, the screw holes of Isohata are not provided at such a place because the lower surfaces of the elements (tab and socket) including the screw holes do not contact the adhesive tapes. In other words, Isohata does not disclose the structure of claim 1. Further, Isohata has no description relating to arranging air bubbles regularly at an adhesive portion.

Similarly, the screw holes of Isohata are different from the plural small isolated recesses of claim 13. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 13 disclose a different structure than the structure disclosed by Isohata.

Claim 23 has been amended for clarity. Claim 23 describes the structure shown in FIGs. 14 and 15, in which the adhesive tape has recesses. In other words, the element having recesses is an adhesive tape, but is not a main frame. As shown in FIGs. 14 and 15, the structure described in claim 23 is effective when the surfaces of a plasma display panel and a main frame are flat. Isohata does not describe an adhesive tape having recesses. Hence, it is unclear what the Examiner means when he asserts, with respect to claim 23, "Isohata discloses like limitations of independent claim 1 and claim 9." Hence, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 23 discloses a different structure than the structure disclosed by Isohata.

Claim 25 has been amended so that the recesses are isolated in order to exclude grooves, which are shown in FIGs. 5A-5C of Isohata, from the scope of the present invention. It is respectfully submitted that FIGs. 5A-5C of Isohata do not disclose isolated recesses. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 25 discloses a different structure than the

structure disclosed by Isohata.

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 13, 23 and 5 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by Isohata et al. (USPN 6,288,489). Since claims 2-12, 14-22, 24 and 26 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 13, 23 and 25, respectively, claims 2-12, 14-22, 24 and 26 are submitted not to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by Isohata et al. (USPN 6,288,489) for at least the reasons that independent claims 1, 13, 23 and 25 are submitted not to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by Isohata et al. (USPN 6,288,489).

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited. At a minimum, this Amendment should be entered at least for purposes of Appeal as it either clarifies and/or narrows the issues for consideration by the Board.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited and possibly concluded by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss any such remaining issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: October 25, 2004

By: Darleen J. Stockley
Darleen J. Stockley
Registration No. 34,257

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501